



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

79
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,650	07/20/2001	Daryl Hlasny	TAL/7146.110	2629
55648	7590	06/05/2006	EXAMINER	
KEVIN L. RUSSELL CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL LLP 1600 ODS TOWER 601 SW SECOND AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			CHEA, PHILIP J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/910,650

Applicant(s)

HLASNY, DARYL

Examiner

Philip J. Chea

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed February 21, 2006. Claims 1-26 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1,3-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Traversat et al. (US 2002/0147771), herein referred to as Traversat.

As per claim 1, Traversat disclose a method of transferring an object from a source device to a destination device, as claimed, comprising:

discovering a plurality of processing devices communicating with said destination device in a manner free from using a central server over a communication channel of said ad hoc network (see Fig. 1B and paragraph [0032]);

identifying a discovered data processing device that facilitates a remotely directed search for a data object in a manner free from using a central server(see paragraph [0092]);

using an identified data processing device to search for said object on discovered said plurality of data processing devices over a communication channel of said ad hoc network wherein said identified data processing device is free from being a central server (see paragraph [0096]); and

selecting a discovered data processing device as source device that is a location of said object as said source device (see paragraph [0098]); and

transferring object from source to destination (see paragraph [0092]).

As per claim 3 and 4, Traversat further disclose the steps of identifying a device that has the data object, as claimed, comprises steps of:

transmitting a query to data processing device (see paragraph [0098]);

Art Unit: 2153

including an address of a data processing device responding to query in a list of devices (see paragraph [0098]), and

[claim 4] including in said list of devices facilitating a remotely directed search for and transfer of a data object an address of another device identified as a device facilitating a remotely directed search for and transfer of a data object in said response to said object search and transfer service query by said device responding to said query (see paragraph [0098]);

As per claim 5, Traversat further disclose the step of searching device for object, as claimed, comprises steps of:

transmitting a search request including a user specified search parameter to data processing device (see paragraph [0096]); and

receiving a response to search request from a data processing device identifying object having relation to search parameter (see paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 6, Traversat further disclose displaying to a user an object identifier of data object identified in response (see paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 7, Traversat further disclose an object name associated with object having relation to search parameter (see paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 8, Traversat further disclose a unique object identifier associated with data object having a relation to search parameter (see Fig. 7).

As per claim 9, Traversat further disclose address of another device which object is located (see paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 10, Traversat further disclose the step of selecting a discovered data processing device comprises the steps of:

transmitting availability query to a device that is a location of object (see paragraph [0096]);

receiving a response to transfer availability query including a measure of availability (see paragraph [0096]); and

selecting a responding device optimizing said measure of availability (see paragraph [0099]).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 11, Traversat further disclose measure of availability comprising measure of data transfer throughput (see paragraph [0081]).

As per claim 12, Traversat further disclose the step of transferring object from source device to destination device comprises the steps of:

determining an availability of source device to transfer a data object (see paragraph [0096];

transmitting to source device a request to transfer object (see paragraph [0096]); and

receiving at destination device data of object (see paragraph [0096]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 17-22, 25, and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION Version 1.1.

In considering claims 2 and 17, although the system disclosed by Traversat shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above in claims 3, 5, 10, and 12), it fails to disclose:

transmitting a paging message over communication channel; and

including an address of a device responding to paging in a device list.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat, as evidenced by BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION et al.

In an analogous art, BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION discloses the file transfer profile between a destination device (client) and a source device (server) for ad hoc networks comprising:

transmitting a paging message (see page 379 Client interaction, where selecting File Transfer Application displays a list of servers that may support the transfer); and

Art Unit: 2153

including an address of a device responding to paging message (see page 379 Client interaction, where a connection takes place implying that the address of the source device is provided to the destination device).

Given the teaching of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat by employing server selection in an ad hoc network, such as disclosed by BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION, in order to see devices that are responsive in the network.

As per claim 18, Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION further disclose displaying to a user an object identifier of data object identified in response (see Traversat paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 19, Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION further disclose an object name associated with object having relation to search parameter (see Traversat paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 20, Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION further disclose a unique object identifier associated with data object having a relation to search parameter (see Traversat Fig. 7).

As per claim 21, Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION further disclose address of another device which object is located (see Traversat paragraph [0096]).

As per claim 22, Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION further disclose measure of availability comprising measure of data transfer throughput (see Traversat paragraph [0081]).

Further, in considering claims 25 and 26, although the system disclosed by Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose:

identifying portion of object not transferred including a measure of quantity of data comprising object; and

comparing a measure of data received to measure of quantity of object.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION, as evidenced by Fielding et al.

Art Unit: 2153

In an analogous art, Fielding et al. discloses a protocol for sending and receiving data from a destination device and a source device comprising:

identifying portion of object not transferred including a measure of quantity of data comprising object (see HTTP/1.1 RFC 2616 section 3.12, where range units can be used to specify the amount of data to be transferred to destination device from source device); and

comparing a measure of data received to measure of quantity of object (see HTTP/1.1 RFC 2616 section 3.12, where range units can be used to specify the amount of data to be transferred to destination device from source device). *It is implied that the amount of the file left to download would be known if the range units were used to specify the amount left to download.*

Given the teaching of Fielding et al., a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION by employing partial file download capability, such as disclosed by Fielding et al., in order to resume a broken download.

In considering claim 26, it is implied that the order of bytes that is sent over using the HTTP/1.1 protocol is in order.

4. Claims 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Kazaa (Kazaa Media Desktop
[URL: http://web.archive.org/web/20001201223800/www.kazaa.com/index.php?page=technology](http://web.archive.org/web/20001201223800/www.kazaa.com/index.php?page=technology)).

As per claim 13, although the system disclosed by Traversat shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose:

receiving a portion of object and an identifier of portion; and

preserving identifier of portion of data.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat, as evidenced by Kazaa.

Art Unit: 2153

In an analogous art, Kazaa discloses a system of transferring an object from a source device to a destination device including a searching means, selecting means, transferring means, and receiving means wherein receiving means comprises steps of:

receiving a portion of data object (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, lines 7-8, where dividing into several chunks = receiving a portion of data); and

preserving said identifier of identifier (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, lines 7-8, where it is implied that the identifier is preserved so the system knows where to start the next chunk).

Given the teaching of Kazaa, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat by employing partial downloading, such as disclosed by Kazaa, in order to improve download speed and reliability (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, line 1).

As per claim 14, although the system disclosed by Traversat shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose:

identifying a portion of object not transferred;

identifying a second source having a second portion of object that has not been transferred; and
requesting transfer of second object from second source.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat, as evidenced by Kazaa.

Kazaa further discloses:

identifying a portion of object not transferred to destination device (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 2, lines 1-5, where when a download fails in the middle of transmission, a second source is tried);

identifying a second source having a second portion of object (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 2, lines 1-5, where identifying is implied considering the download is attempted from another source); and

Art Unit: 2153

requesting transfer of second portion of object from second source (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 2, lines 1-5, where requesting download is implied considering the download is attempted from another source).

Given the teaching of Kazaa, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat by employing a recovered download attempt from another source, such as disclosed by Kazaa, in order to improve the reliability that the transmission will be completed (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, line 1).

5. Claims 15 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat in view of Kazaa as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Fielding et al. (HTTP/1.1 RFC 2616). Although the system disclosed by Traversat in view of Kazaa shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose:

identifying portion of object not transferred including a measure of quantity of data comprising object; and

comparing a measure of data received to measure of quantity of object.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat in view of Kazaa, as evidenced by Fielding et al.

In an analogous art, Fielding et al. discloses a protocol for sending and receiving data from a destination device and a source device comprising:

identifying portion of object not transferred including a measure of quantity of data comprising object (see HTTP/1.1 RFC 2616 section 3.12, where range units can be used to specify the amount of data to be transferred to destination device from source device); and

comparing a measure of data received to measure of quantity of object (see HTTP/1.1 RFC 2616 section 3.12, where range units can be used to specify the amount of data to be transferred to destination device from source device). *It is implied that the amount of the file left to download would be known if the range units were used to specify the amount left to download.*

Art Unit: 2153

Given the teaching of Fielding et al., a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat in view of Kazaa by employing partial file download capability, such as disclosed by Fielding et al., in order to resume a broken download.

In considering claim 16, it is implied that the order of bytes that is sent over using the HTTP/1.1 protocol is in order.

6. Claims 23 and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Kazaa (Kazaa Media Desktop

URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20001201223800/www.kazaa.com/index.php?page=technology>).

As per claim 23, although the system disclosed by Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose:

receiving a portion of object and an identifier of portion; and
preserving identifier of portion of data.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION, as evidenced by Kazaa.

In an analogous art, Kazaa discloses a system of transferring an object from a source device to a destination device including a searching means, selecting means, transferring means, and receiving means wherein receiving means comprises steps of:

receiving a portion of data object (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, lines 7-8, where dividing into several chunks = receiving a portion of data); and

preserving said identifier of identifier (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, lines 7-8, where it is implied that the identifier is preserved so the system knows where to start the next chunk).

Given the teaching of Kazaa, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH

Art Unit: 2153

SPECIFICATION by employing partial downloading, such as disclosed by Kazaa, in order to improve download speed and reliability (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, line 1).

As per claim 24, although the system disclosed by Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose:

- identifying a portion of object not transferred;

- identifying a second source having a second portion of object that has not been transferred; and
- requesting transfer of second object from second source.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION, as evidenced by Kazaa.

Kazaa further discloses:

- identifying a portion of object not transferred to destination device (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 2, lines 1-5, where when a download fails in the middle of transmission, a second source is tried);

- identifying a second source having a second portion of object (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 2, lines 1-5, where identifying is implied considering the download is attempted from another source); and

- requesting transfer of second portion of object from second source (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 2, lines 1-5, where requesting download is implied considering the download is attempted from another source).

Given the teaching of Kazaa, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Traversat in view of BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION by employing a recovered download attempt from another source, such as disclosed by Kazaa, in order to improve the reliability that the transmission will be completed (see Intelligent Downloads, paragraph 1, line 1).

Art Unit: 2153

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJC 5/1/06


Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER